



SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or
September 3, 2013

WORK SESSION

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Bill Middleton called the meeting to order at 6:24pm.
- 2. COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Bill Middleton, Council President Linda Henderson, Councilors Bill Butterfield, Matt Langer, Dave Grant, Krisanna Clark and Robyn Folsom.
- 3. STAFF PRESENT:** Joseph Gall City Manager, Tom Pessemier Assistant City Manager, Julia Hajduk Community Development Director, Craig Sheldon Public Works Director, Richard Sattler Public Works Utility Manager, Kristen Switzer Community Services Director, Colleen Resch Administrative Assistant and Sylvia Murphy City Recorder.
- 4. TOPICS DISCUSSED:**

A. Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) Project

Craig Sheldon Public Works Director provided an introduction and informed the Council that funding of \$300,000 is available in this year's budget to start the project. Rich Sattler Public Works Utility Manager presented information (see record, Exhibit A). Rich recapped the presentation and stated staff would provide an overview, explain AMR and AMI, provide information on a business case analysis, provide information on the benefits of the system, provide information on budget and future funding and provide information on the schedule.

Rich recapped the presentation and explained the Existing System:

- Sherwood purchased a used meter reading system from TVWD in 2008, equipment was purchased for \$1 through our cooperative agreement
- Included Itron Meter Reading software
- Reading software is linked to Hansen for billing
- Included G5 multiple handhelds
- Handhelds are currently not support by vendor as of this year
- Meters read monthly, approximately 5700 meters
- Fire line and large meters require confined space entry
- Require multiple staff for each meter reading
- Re-read of meters prior to billing (700 in year 2012)
- Misread / high consumption

Rich explained AMR and AMI:

Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) is a technology used for automating collection of metered water consumption data for the purposes of real-time billing and consumption analysis (touch read, drive by). Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) is a system that measures, collects, and analyzes water usage through various communication media on request or on a pre-defined schedule (fixed network, endpoints, antennae, collectors).

Rich explained Business Case Analysis:

- Worked with meter manufacturer to determine if an AMI system is an efficient solution for Sherwood
- Sherwood provided data for a number of factors
- Staffing of meter reader/UB
- Types of service provided, re-reads, on/off, move in-out
- Annual cost of equipment/depreciation
- Meter age
- Total consumption per meter size and class
- Accuracy of meter
- Meter Manufactured Model
- Used industry averages for inputs not obtained through Sherwood data
- Propagation Study
- Meter GPS data
- City assets (towers, buildings, street light poles)
- **Results of Case Analysis**
- Implementation duration effects rate of return:
- 1 year implementation, \$318k per year savings or 5.7 year payback
- 2 year implementation, \$295k per year savings or 6.3 year payback
- 5 year implementation , \$286k per year savings or 7.1 year payback

Rich explained Benefits of AMI:

- Customer side leaks
- Leak adjustments (355,000 units last year)
- Reversal of flow
- Can't read meters
- Data logging, allowing 40 days of history
- Inactive meters, explained snowbirds
- Move in/out - 1,112 special reads
- Reports, queries, analysis, allows for future decisions on rates
- Customer service
- Stuck meters
- Reduce carbon foot print
- Vehicle, fuel
- Labor
- Can redeploy staff to more skilled positions
- Use staff in programs where we are currently lacking
- Lost revenue (water and sanitary), explained the older the meter, the less it will potentially record
- Aged meters, over half of meters are 15 years or older, explained options for meter replacement. Explained the analysis is for replacement of all meters, cost could be less
- Conservation, Water Right Permit Benchmarks
- Leak detection

- Rate structure

Rich explained other jurisdictions that have implemented the system, or who are in test pilot mode.

Rich explained Budget:

- Current budget of \$300k
- Fee schedule currently covers cost of AMI system for new meters
- New Development would require AMI meter
- Estimated cost of \$1.5 million for implementation, 5 year payback
- Lead Law may cause increase in program costs (effective beginning of 2014).
- Not all water meters will be required to be changed out. Some meters will only require the register to be changed out and radio to be installed. This will allow us to keep newer meters in our system that historically do not have inaccuracies. Meter cost is approx. \$200 with \$25 in labor.
- Re-investment
- Use part of the payment from Wilsonville once transmission line is completed for Segment 3.
- Budget (meter program), at \$300k per year

Rich Explained Next Steps:

- Work Session with Council, September 2013
- Evaluate cooperative agreements with other municipalities
- If successful, Council could award contract as early as November 2013
- If needed, publish request for proposal and evaluate (90 days)
- Council Award of contract– January 2014
- Begin Implementation – Spring 2014

Discussion occurred regarding cost and budgeting and phasing in the AMI system over the next few years. Currently having \$300k in the budget and the remainder being budgeted every year moving forward, and potentially using the payback from Wilsonville, and applying for grants. Craig stated the payback from Wilsonville once the water project was completed could be used, discussion occurred regarding what that amount would be and paying off loans with those funds.

Mayor Middleton commented regarding speaking with the auditor and they recommending moving utility billing to the finance department to allow for a streamlined billing process and more efficiencies. He said this was a recommendation from the auditor that will probably be presented this year. Discussion occurred regarding changes in the current processes and budgeting.

Craig Sheldon explained budgeting and the current fee schedule. Rich provided information on a current development project and said the decision had not been made on the meter type and the developer was paying for the meters. He explained phasing in the project verses using the payback from Wilsonville which was just a suggestion.

Craig explained the process of going through our system and selecting old meters and then phasing in the meters that are at the 10 year mark. Tom Pessemier provided information regarding the volume of current development, what was plotted and others that have just begun the land use process. Discussion occurred regarding the Hansen Software supporting the new meters and staff explained it would support and may need some upgrades. Rich confirmed this was budgeted for and explained this would be part of the RFP requirements.

Mayor Middleton stated he would like to move slow with the budgeted \$300,000 and look at the next budget cycle and by this time we will have the money from Wilsonville and will know where we stand. He said he did not want to commit \$1.5 million now.

Craig stated he was looking for direction from the Council on which direction to go. Council conceded to move forward with the new technology.

5. ADJOURN:

Mayor Middleton adjourned the work session at 7:04 pm and convened to a regular Council Session.

REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Middleton called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

3. COUNCIL PRESENT: Mayor Bill Middleton, Council President Linda Henderson, Councilors Dave Grant, Bill Butterfield, Robyn Folsom, Krisanna Clark and Matt Langer.

4. STAFF AND LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT: Joseph Gall City Manager, Tom Pessemier Assistant City Manager, Ty Hanlon Police Captain, Julia Hajduk Community Development Director, Kristen Switzer Community Services Director, Craig Sheldon Public Works Director, Bob Galati City Engineer, Michelle Miller Senior Planner, Administrative Assistant Colleen Resch and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy. City Attorney Chris Crean.

Mayor Middleton addressed the Consent Agenda and asked for a motion.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:

A. Approval of August 20, 2013 Council Meeting Minutes

B. Approval of August 22, 2013 Council Meeting Minutes

C. Resolution 2013-050 Authorizing the City Manager to sign the 2013 IGA with Washington County for the purposes of continued participation in the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI)

D. Resolution 2013-051 Authorizing the City Manager to sign an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Washington County Health and Human Services for the purposes of supporting the Sherwood Youth Substance Abuse Team

MOTION: FROM COUNCIL PRESIDENT HENDERSON TO ADOPT THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR CLARK, MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Middleton addressed the next agenda item.

6. PRESENTATIONS:

A. Proclamation Declaring Constitution Week

Mayor Middleton stated the City will proclaim the week of September 17-23, 2013, as Constitution Week. He read the proclamation which stated the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution provides a historic opportunity for all Americans to realize the achievement of all the framers of the Constitution and the rights, privileges and responsibilities it affords. He urged all citizens to celebrate and to reflect during this week the many benefits of our Federal Constitution and American Leadership.

Mayor Middleton addressed the next agenda item.

7. PUBLIC HEARING-Business Carried Forward

A. Ordinance 2013-003 to amend Section 16.12 of the Zoning and Community Development Code relating to property zoned Very Low Density Residential

Senior Planner Michelle Miller came forward and said that she needed to address a procedural issue. She stated that Council last heard this text amendment in May 2013, where they took public testimony and decided to continue the deliberation based on the amount of information that was received. She said that between that meeting and now the Council, through email, received additional information concerning the text amendment that needs to be incorporated into the record. She noted because they were received the public has an opportunity to respond to the issues in the emails. She said there are two different alternatives the Council can take; to allow the public testimony on any issue concerning the text amendment or allow public testimony limited to the issues at hand regarding the emails that have been received by the Council.

Mayor Middleton said he would prefer to open the hearing only on the accepted written letters that came in and the people who wrote those could come up and testify. He said it is limited to those people. Council agreed.

Michelle clarified that there is a motion to reopen the hearing for the purposes of taking testimony on the issues concerning the emails that were received since the last hearing in May. Council confirmed.

Michelle proceeded with a presentation (see record, Exhibit B) that gave a process update since May 21, 2013, that included a Planned Unit Development (PUD) text amendment and Planning Commission recommendations to the Council. She said the concerns came down to three issues: lot size minimums available for PUD in this particular zone, the maximum allowable density when developing as a PUD, and it included elements of the SE Sherwood Master Plan. She said floating through all of those issues, is the area that is part of the Ken Foster Farm DEQ contaminated soil site. She said she will update the Council on developments that occurred over the summer.

She recapped and said initially the City received an application to amend the very low density language for a PUD to reduce the lot size and also increase the amount of density that could be within a PUD. She said the Planning Commission held multiple meetings and came up with the recommendation of the ordinance with multiple exhibits back in April. She noted the initial meeting on this was May 21, 2013 where they began deliberation but wanted more time to review the information and that is where we are for this hearing.

She referred to an aerial of the site in the presentation and said this only affects properties that are zoned very low density residential and it includes about 5 properties that are still undeveloped in this area which is East of SW Murdock Road in between two subdivisions, Fair Oaks to the North and Sherwood View Estates to the South. She said it is approximately 36 acres and is considered the Tonquin Scablands, an environmentally sensitive area where the Missoula Floods Glacier scoured the land and left a rocky terrain and said it makes development tricky in this area as well.

She said the first issue is minimum lot size and in residential zones in Sherwood, for very low density the minimum lot size is 40,000 square feet but if a developer wants to use a PUD they're allowed 10,000 square foot minimum. She referred to lot sizes ranging up to our high density residential of 5,000 square feet minimum for single family unit. She said this is not changing from the recommendation of the Planning Commission, by keeping it at a 10,000 square foot minimum.

She referred to residential land use density and said it is a different issue. She noted currently the very low density allows up to 1 unit per acre, and this recommendation allows for 4 units per acre with a PUD where the current standard is 2 units per acre, so that is changing. She said the recommendation considered the comparison of the 7,000-9,000 square foot lots to the left and the 7,000-12,000 square foot lots to the right and the density is taking out all of the roadway and open space, so it comes to 3.6 dwelling units per acre, just to give a comparison. She said the proposal on the table is for 4 units per acre.

She said another issue about this area is there was a grant in 2006 to develop a SE Sherwood Master Plan and back in 2006 they knew the area was challenging to develop and the developers and the property owners got together to address some of the issues in this area and a grant was provided. She stated funding ran out before a consensus was reached on what to do with the area but it got as far as a Planning Commission Resolution to consider this alternative when new properties are being developed. She noted the challenge is that there are no teeth in this plan and Council really needs to adopt it to determine what the community desires for this area. She stated the Planning Commission wanted to give Council several alternatives to consider, one being to deny the application as a whole since so much time has passed since the plan was developed and regroup and consider planning that area a new. She said some of the property owners have changed and some of the terrain has changed and some of the open space is now unsuitable. She stated another alternative is to come up with language that incorporates this and the components of the SE Sherwood Master Plan into the text amendment, and that is what the Planning Commission recommended, if the Council should consider moving forward with the text amendment.

She referred to the Ken Foster Farm site and said this was an area that took tannery hides from the Frontier Leather facility in the 1960s and 1970s and used them as a soil amendment. She noted in 2006 the area was found to be contaminated with hexavalent chromium and DEQ listed it as a site on their database. She stated in 2011 the DEQ updated the acceptable concentrations for hexavalent chromium and areas that would require more cleanup. She noted this summer the DEQ is conducting further investigation in the area, and developing a plan for how to address the contamination and sampling in areas near houses and yards, so cleanup will be most intense in those areas. She noted as the City continues to monitor the area, any development proposal will have to comply with any DEQ remediation efforts.

Michelle asked if the Council had any questions.

Councilor Butterfield asked what exactly is the Planning Commission's recommendation. Michelle responded that the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation, approval of the text amendment with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet if developed as a PUD along with minimum density of 4 units per acre if they follow the guidelines of the SE Sherwood Master Plan and those are identified in the text amendment as things to consider, such as open space, the exiting developments in the area, creating buffers with existing subdivisions in the area, and intensifying development in the other areas.

Councilor Butterfield said it sounds like they are not sure what they want and they are asking us for our recommendation. Michelle responded it is true, since so much time has passed since 2006 and there was no clear cut answer that this is what the community wants from this area. She said there are counter opinions from developers who find it challenging to develop the property which remains relatively undeveloped, and from the people that live there want to maintain the existing feel.

Councilor Butterfield stated that he is still confused as to what they want us to do. Michelle said they wanted to give you alternatives, but Council could suggest that we revisit and develop a new master plan for the area and devote funds and staff time for that endeavor. She said if Council feels that the language is close enough to what the SE Sherwood Master Plan was envisioning, they provided language that would incorporate some of those elements, and that is identified in the code language itself. She stated because it was never adopted through an ordinance the Planning commission is unclear, as well, as far as what the Council and the community wants as a whole for this particular area.

Julia said they were torn and did not want to forward a recommendation of denial or adopt the SW Sherwood Master Plan because they knew you may have a different decision and you may decide that you want to approve it so they wanted to give you parameters that were acceptable to them, so the recommendation of approval with the lot size and the density and following the SE Sherwood Master Plan principal, if you choose to approve, these are the acceptable parameters we would recommend, but it is a policy choice of whether you want to approve or not and if you do the recommendation is to approve with these changes.

Mayor Middleton asked what the current lot size is if we did not take this option and just left it alone. Michelle stated it is currently 10,000 square foot minimum for a PUD, which means it goes through Planning Commission and Council for approval of that lot size. She said for a standard subdivision, without the PUD the lot size is 40,000 square foot minimum. She said there are already two PUDs in that zone, which are the Fair Oaks subdivision and the Sherwood View Estates.

Mayor Middleton asked if they are at a 10,000 square foot minimum lot size. Michelle responded that the Sherwood View Estates has the 10,000 square foot lot minimum, but they range from 10,000-12,000 square feet and that is where you get a density of 3.6, with a PUD. She said the applicant at the last hearing indicated that they were asking for lot sizes of 8,500 square feet, but that is not the Planning Commission recommendation.

Council President Henderson asked if the Planning Commission wanted to make a recommendation that was consistent with the current planning use of the areas North and South of this development.

Michelle said most definitely and said they heard a lot of public testimony from the residents in the area of the importance of preserving the area, maintaining the buffers and keeping the rural feel.

Councilor Henderson said when we talk how it has been 7 years since SE Sherwood Master Plan group was formed is there anything to imply that this level of development is not consistent with what people want out there, based on the testimony that we received. She said she realized that some of the question is subjective, but she said we need to decide whether to allow a certain amount of density or reform a subcommittee and ask developers and people that live out and around there, would be acceptable to spend more staff time to do it again. She stated that haven't we just done that by collecting information about what people want to see developed out there.

Julia responded that she could answer part of the question. She said the reason why there has not been development out there since this happened was that even when it was recognized by the Planning Commission, they felt that the residents in the area would have to get together and do something else, or a next step, like a plan amendment or something to make the plan a reality. She said that now as ownerships have changed and more information about the DEQ contamination has come to light, the economy and other factors led to nothing happening within that timeframe. She said that the Council received the testimony early on and in the packet about how people on the outside edges of the area feel about development and she does not know if that has changed.

Councilor Henderson asked if the new information from the DEQ testing would change a density recommendation, or would the new information include a level of density? Michelle said that she has posed that question to DEQ and they do not want to officially answer. She stated they are analyzing the soil as if the density is one unit per acre, which is the current zoning. She said the denser the development the greater cleanup would have to occur to make it safe to live there.

Councilor Folsom commented regarding doing a text amendment to the code, and said wouldn't this apply to all areas of the community. Michelle responded that this particular amendment applies exclusively to the very low density zone. She said it only affects that if it is developed as a PUD.

Councilor Folsom clarified that this is the only area where this text amendment might apply. Michelle said that is correct.

Councilor Folsom said that she is concerned about safety and said it is her understanding that the developers that want to develop there want smaller lot sizes in order to make more money to pay for the expensive clean up. Michelle said yes and the roadway getting back there and the public infrastructure, and sidewalks that are required are also expensive.

Councilor Folsom asked when we would have more information from the DEQ on this issue. Michelle responded that they are phasing out the project and phase 1 involves primarily the Yuzon's property and that is where they found the most initial contamination to occur and the rest they are spreading it out into a grid pattern. So they will know more when they finish this phase 1.

Councilor Folsom asked for a date or a timeline. Michelle said this will go on for a few weeks and then they will go back and it is based on receiving grant funding, which is how they are paying for it because they are considered orphan sites as the people that own it are not responsible for the contamination.

Councilor Butterfield said he would hate to see us have to pay for duplicated services so he said keep that in mind; he doesn't want to have staff start all over again at the beginning and rebuild this thing.

Tom Pessemier asked Julia Hajduk what the original grant was for the SE Sherwood Master Plan. Julia responded that it was Quick Response Grant through the State which is different than a TGM grant and she said she believes it was for about \$80,000.

Mayor Middleton said that he would like to see the final DEQ answer. He said he does not want to give them permission and then have to change if the DEQ results come in.

Councilor Langer asked if this is approved as a text amendment it still does not let the property owners off the hook for the DEQ cleanup process. Michelle said that as she understands it the DEQ is cleaning it up for the property owners that currently reside there, that is what DEQ is responsible for. She said if there is additional development, there will be a new program established to determine who pays for that.

Tom said he does not know if the DEQ is fully committed to cleaning it up to a certain level at this point. He said a lot will come out in the analysis of what they find and said they have limited funds as well. He stated there is still a court case going on. He suggested that is the maximum level they would go to if funds were available. He answered Councilor Langer that yes, before anyone can build on the site they need to meet the DEQ requirements. He asked if the Mayor was going to open this up for testimony and if so this may be a good time.

Chris Crean clarified that anyone is allowed to respond to what is in the emails, but they have to speak on the topic of the emails only.

Julia asked Michelle to point out to the Council the pages in the packet that include the emails that we will be discussing.

Mayor Middleton opened the public hearing on the two written comments. With no public coming forward the Mayor closed the public hearing.

Mayor Middleton said that from what he read he is in favor of leaving the 10,000 square foot lots to remain consistent with the other residents that are around there.

Councilor Grant agreed with the consistency and said it sounds like this is the option supported by the Planning Commission.

Council President Henderson and Councilor Clark stated they also agree.

With no other comments or questions, Mayor Middleton called for a motion on the ordinance.

MOTION: FROM COUNCIL PRESIDENT HENDERSON TO READ CAPTION AND ADOPT ORDINANCE 2013-003 TO AMEND SECTION 16.12 OF THE ZONING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE RELATING TO PROPERTY ZONED VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR LANGER, MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL PRESENT COUNCIL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

City Manager Gall confirmed with the Council and stated if the motion suggested passes, what does it mean. He said we wanted to make sure the Council understands their decision. Council President Henderson stated she understands that we are accepting the Planning Commission's recommendation of no more than 4 units per acre and a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet consistent with the development that resides to the North and the South.

Mayor Middleton addressed the next agenda item.

8. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Eugene Stewart, PO Box 534, came forward to discuss the successful Senior Center banquet and thanked the City for their cooperation and support. He noted it appears, between the two organizations that sponsored it, they cleared somewhere between \$6,500 and \$8,000. He said it is apparent that with the completion of the update there is still a problem regarding the bathroom doors being stuck open because they are not ADA compliant. He commented that he heard the project was over budget and said they cut out the automatic closers for the bathroom doors. He said now there is no way to open and close them except manually and they are heavy. He stated he heard they cost between \$15,000 and \$20,000. He also referred to the agreement with Loaves and Fishes, which expires June 30, 2014 and said we need to figure out what we are going to do, if Loaves and Fishes are interested in continuing or if the City and the Senior Center can do it more efficiently. He gave suggestions and stated what is involved is the Director is paid thorough fundraising efforts and there is a high level for the Director to raise money for the position. He stated if the City takes over the contract they need to determine how much the rentals from the site could generate. He said we need to look at raising enough funds to pay the Director or the City could contribute a small amount. He suggested not waiting and there is a need to form a committee to look at this issue and not let it slip beneath the screen.

Anthony Bevel, SW Lynnly, approached the Council and referred to the Council wanting citizen input then said they don't want involvement. He referred to when the citizens found out about the Walmart and he said the citizens mobilized into a group and now they are organized. He said Council found strong opposition to the Walmart and to placate the citizens they formed a Special Committee to draft ordinances on how to conduct business in Sherwood. He commented it was a brilliant ploy and said they never intended to listen to the Special Committee. He referred to the hard work of the citizens on the committee and said they were kicked to the curb. He heard that it would cost \$5,000 to put the proposals of the committee on the November ballot and said the City is \$4 million in the hole right now. He said he heard the ordinance would not hold up to the scrutiny of the law and noted the Special Committee had access to City Lawyers and he asked how the proposals slipped by the Lawyers to present to the Council with something that would not withstand the scrutiny of the law. He said the Council kicked it to the curb saying that they will visit or come back to the proposals in the near future and asked the Council if they had any intention of revisiting these proposals.

Mayor Middleton addressed the next agenda item.

9. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Butterfield said that he and his wife had the opportunity to go around and meet some of the City employees this week and brought them goodies. He said they went to the Public Works Department,

City Hall, Police Department and the Fire Department. He said it was great, they got to hear from some of the hard working employees and he learned more about what our employees do.

Council President Henderson thanked the staff for the All City Staff barbeque and the invitation. She said they don't often have time to spend with staff when they are not working. She reminded everyone that schools are starting and there are a number of school zones in the community and she reminded everyone to pay attention and slowdown in the school zones.

Mayor Middleton said the Planning Commission will bring back the Town Center Plan to Council at the next meeting and said he wanted to thank the Planning Commission for their work as it was a long process and they did a great job and said it is a good plan.

Mayor Middleton addressed the next agenda item.

10. CITY MANAGER REPORT

City Manager Gall asked City Engineer Bob Galati and Community Services Director Kristen Switzer to come before the Council and address the concerns raised by Eugene Stewart regarding the restroom doors at the Senior Center.

Kristen stated that the doors meet ADA standards and have been replaced and stated they were originally planned to have an ADA Assist, but it was taken out for budget cuts, but they kept the same doors. She noted the doors are heavier than we wish they were, but they do meet the requirements. She noted the seniors have chosen to prop them open because they are still too heavy.

Bob said they have lightened the action on the doors to decrease the amount of force necessary to open, but when you are talking about moving a walker and trying to pull the door open, it makes it difficult. He said the doors have sensors located on them and are set up for future installation of the assists, so that can be accomplished, but they are very expensive and made the cost of putting them in almost a no go for the project. He stated at a future point in time they can install all of the assists.

Councilor Folsom asked how much that might be. Bob responded they were \$3,500 to \$5,000 a piece and by the time you took everything into account you had \$20,000 for three doors; men's, women's and unisex bathroom doors.

Councilor Folsom referred to Eugene Stewart's comments regarding our contribution to the Loaves and Fishes fundraising requirements and asked Kristen if that was \$30,000 this year. Kristen said that she believed that it was and said from what she understands, they have met the goal because they could include rentals and other ways towards that.

Councilor Folsom noted the fund raising is tough and said she heard great reports about this year's Senior Center Dinner.

Councilor Henderson asked what was the total cost of the project. Kristen responded that the original amount was \$224,000 and with an addition \$30,000, the total was \$254,000.

Councilor Henderson asked if the project was over budget and if that is when the automatic doors were taken out. Kristen said that is correct and when we went out to bid the bids came in higher. Bob said yes, we had to cut things at bid time because they came in so high and then asked for the additional funds, and to get anything done this is what they had to do.

Councilor Henderson said since we decided not to do the assist doors was it just an oversight that we ordered the heavy doors or was it already in the building specs. Bob said that is was already in the specs. She commented then it would have been a change order.

Council Henderson asked what they attribute to the cost overruns. Bob responded that as far as cost overruns they came in according to budget, which they had to according to the grant. He said some of the things we did was change the flooring to bring it back into budget and held the contractor to a higher standard to make sure things got done according to the specs. He said they did not add things to change the cost, and as far as he knows they are coming in pretty much on target and maybe a little over, perhaps only be 1/10 of 1 percent over.

Councilor Henderson asked when the project will be done. Bob said that they are doing the punch list which is the last, but most time consuming part of the project and it depends on how long it takes the contractor to do it right. He suggested maybe another week.

City Manager Gall referred to another issue Eugene Stewart raised, which the Council spoke of at the Council Retreat, about the future of Loaves and Fishes, and said that is something that we need to be prepared to put in the budget and will have to start talking with them right away and we may have some decisions to make that will impact finances to continue operations there.

Mr. Gall announced that there are 242 cities in Oregon and most have City Recorders and as of a year ago only 32 City Recorders in the State have achieved the Master Municipal Clerk Certification and he announced that City Recorder Sylvia Murphy is one of those and would be the 33 in the state. He spoke of her career, which she should be proud of, and said he wanted the Council and the community to know about her service. He stated she joined the City in 2006 and immediately joined the International Institute of Municipal Clerks and the Oregon Association of Municipal Recorders. He noted from 2006 to 2009 she attended various conferences and academies offered by OAMR and in 2009 she received the Certified Municipal Clerk Certification, which is the first level of certification. She continued her education from 2010 to recently by going to a variety of conferences and academies to achieve this certification which she obtained in August 2013. He said that he has had the opportunity to work with City Recorders throughout Oregon and Sylvia is the best he has had the privilege of working with. He wanted to acknowledge her efforts to achieve this certification. He thanked her and congratulated her on her achievement. He referred to all the work that goes into helping you as a Council do your job and stated she is the key. He commented that City Recorders are the glue to keep things moving forward and it is a very important position.

Mr. Gall reported that the Finance Director position has final interviews this Thursday and we originally had 4 candidates they were interviewing, but one has dropped out for personal reasons so they will be interviewing 3 on Thursday. He said this process should be wrapping up this next week with a selection.

Mr. Gall asked Tom Pessemier to update the Council on the Special Committee work that was done over the summer.

Tom said that they are continuing to work on the hazardous substance issue and said the Council asked staff to talk to the City of Eugene regarding their hazardous substance ordinance, as to how often it is used and what was the impetus for adopting in the first place. He stated he spoke with the Code Enforcement Manager who does enforcement for the majority of the code. Tom explained that Eugene is different, and they adopt an ordinance, then they adopt administrative rules that implement code revisions. He said the Code Enforcement Manager remembered that they were having cooperation problems at the time with other agencies and there were concerns about working together so the City felt that they needed tools to make sure things could be effectively dealt with. He said they started but never finished and never adopted the administrative rule, so it was never fully implemented and have they never used that code section as far as he can remember. Tom said he wanted to give Council that feedback and asked if this is something Council wanted to pursue.

Mayor Middleton suggested having the Fire Department and Police Department give us a talk on if we have a spill how it is handled and who pays for it, before we get to work on an ordinance. He said we may have a lot of this covered and he would like to know before spending more time. He asked if the rest of the Council would be in favor.

Mr. Gall asked if he was considering a work session.

Mayor Middleton said it would be good for the public to have a brief, 15 minute presentation, and it would be good to do in a Council meeting in front of the public and video recorded. Tom commented that it would address a lot of the reason that they originally did this and he said it is his understanding that the DEQ and the Fire Department do a great job in coordinating and it would be helpful to let the public know.

Tom commented on the camping ordinance and said staff plans on bringing this back in ordinance form to be addressed at the October 1, 2013 City Council meeting and he asked if the Council would prefer to have a work session prior to the Council meeting or just have it addressed as old business moving forward.

Councilor Butterfield commented that it should be presented in an open session. No other comments or objections were received.

With no other business to address, Mayor Middleton adjourned the meeting.

11. ADJOURN

Mayor Middleton adjourned at 8:05 pm.

Submitted by:

Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder

Bill Middleton, Mayor